

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 16 are pending. Please cancel non-elected claims 9 - 16. Claims 1 – 8 stand rejected Applicant respectfully transverses the rejection and requests allowance of claims 1 – 8.

Claims 1 – 7 are rejected under 102(b) as being anticipated by FCC report No. CC 98-28. Changing the rules that dictate what is required on a telephone bill is not the same thing as inventing a billing system that can calculate a single invoice for the customer that includes network charges and third party charges. FCC report No. CC 98 – 28 is a report dictating what information should be on future telephone bills but does not teach how the bill should be generated. It's a statement of a problem, not a solution to the problem. FCC report No. CC 98 – 28 does not state how a billing system can capture the information from a communications system and from third party systems and integrate that information into a single invoice. FCC report No. CC 98 – 28 does not anticipate, nor does it make obvious, how to create the billing system of claim 1.

Claim 1 requires “receiving network information from the communication network into the billing system” and “receiving third party information from the third party network into the billing system”. FCC report No. CC 98 – 28 does not teach receiving network information into a billing system. FCC report No. CC 98 – 28 does not teach receiving third party information into the billing system. In fact FCC report No. CC 98 – 28 does not talk about a billing system at all. FCC report No. CC 98 – 28 only talks about what should be required on a bill. FCC report No. CC 98 – 28 does not teach how to create a bill using information from different communication systems, but only talks about what the bill should contain.

Claim 1 requires “calculating a single invoice for the customer that includes the network charges and third party charges”. FCC report N. 98 – 28 does not teach or suggest that network charges and third party charges are included on a single invoice. FCC report No. CC 98 – 28 states that “clear, informative telephone bills are increasingly important as bills include charges for a growing number of services and service providers”. FCC report No. CC 98 – 28 does not indicate that the charges for the different services and service providers are integrated into a single invoice. A bill containing multiple invoices with the different invoices describing the charges for the different

service providers satisfies the requirement of FCC report No. CC 98 - 28. FCC report No. CC 98 - 28 does not indicate that third party charges and network charges must be integrated into a single invoice as required by claim 1. Bills including multiple invoices were known in the art at the time of this invention.

Based on the above comments, the Applicants submit that the examiner has not met the requirements for a *prima facie* case of anticipation and claim 1 is allowable as written.

Claims 2 - 8 are dependent on allowable claim 1 and are therefore allowable.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, the Applicants submit that claims 1 - 8 are allowable. There may be additional reasons in support of patentability, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of brevity. The Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1 - 8.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/10/06



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Steven L. Webb, Reg. No. 44,395
Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100